

## 520 Tolling Implementation Committee - Public Comments Received

Comment	
<b>From:</b>	Janet Shaff
<b>Source:</b>	info@build520.org
<b>Date:</b>	09/26/2008
<b>Zip Code:</b>	unknown
<b>Comment:</b>	I believe that there should be a combination of Federal, State funding & tolls on BOTH floating bridges to replace the 520 bridge. If there are tolls on 520, but not I-90, then traffic will simply shift to I-90 to avoid the tolls.
<b>From:</b>	Dave Hrsuka
<b>Source:</b>	info@build520.org
<b>Date:</b>	09/26/2008
<b>Zip Code:</b>	98033
<b>Comment:</b>	I am adamantly opposed to any tolling on either 520 or 90. I am ok with a nominal toll on 520 (for traveling across the bridge only), once the new bridge is complete.
<b>From:</b>	Jill Tracy
<b>Source:</b>	Mail
<b>Date:</b>	10/07/2008
<b>Zip Code:</b>	98053
<b>Comment:</b>	I support early "variable pricing" tolling of the 520 and I-90 bridges to bring quick and effective solutions to our region's transportation problems. We should set the tolls so they will pay to rebuild the bridge and fund transportation choices. This will help relieve congestion and reduce climate change pollution.
<b>From:</b>	Stone
<b>Source:</b>	Mail
<b>Date:</b>	10/13/2008
<b>Zip Code:</b>	98008
<b>Comment:</b>	Dear Committee Member:  I support early "variable pricing" tolling of the 520 and I-90 bridges to bring quick and effective solutions to our region's transportation problems. We should set the tolls so that they will pay to rebuild the 520 bridge and fund transportation choices. This will help relieve congestion and reduce climate change pollution.
<b>From:</b>	Jim Connely
<b>Source:</b>	info@build520.org
<b>Date:</b>	10/23/2008

**Zip Code:** 98053

**Comment:** Start tolling on both bridges ASAP; make it as low as possible (2-3 dollars round trip) and then adjust the toll for inflation after the bridge is completed. Thanks.

**From:** Anonymous

**Source:** info@build520.org

**Date:** 11/01/2008

**Zip Code:** unknown

**Comment:** Keep it simple.  
A) Toll only the 520 bridge, the one we are replacing!  
B) Begin tolling sooner rather than later.  
C) Make a FLAT RATE TOLL for every crossing no matter the time of day or day of week.  
D) Keep the toll LOW (e.g. \$1.00 per crossing) so that people don't take alternate routes and make congestion a mess everywhere.  
E) Continue tolling until bridge is paid for and a sensible maintenance fund is funded.  
\*SIMPLIFY YOUR IDEAS and lower the toll - then people will use the bridge, not to be confused as to time of day at what fee, and will continue normal patterns. I think it will pay for itself quicker if you keep the toll low so it's not a big issue.

**From:** Mary Carothers

**Source:** info@build520.org

**Date:** 11/04/2008

**Zip Code:** 98052

**Comment:** Hello,

I work at the North End and use both bridges on a regular basis. Since where I work charges high prices for parking- I have tried to use the bus several times per week. My salary has not gone up-and I saw some of the tolling options you are considering. All of them are beyond me-and while my employer is partially subsidizing my bus pass- I am also paying heavily for it-including taxes. I have also found that when a toll is put on in this state-it never is removed-but increased.

I am very worried about what I will do. It appears the only option in this case is to find new employment that will not involve crossing a bridge.

**From:** Klaus Meyn

**Source:** info@build520.org

**Date:** 11/05/2008

**Zip Code:** 98052

**Comment:** I have previously submitted my input via e-mail. Do I still have to attend one of the meetings to have my point of view be considered.

Thank you

**From:** Rick Logwood

**Source:** info@build520.org

**Date:** 11/06/2008

**Zip Code:** 98033

**Comment:** Recognizing the current analysis regarding rates, diversion, and timing:

Move forward with implementing tolling on SR 520 now, while allowing debate and FHWA to come to a conclusion on the additional benefits/improvements and long term M&O provisions for I-90 to be reached, subsequently moving forward with tolling on both SR 520 and I90. This then lead to disussion/evaluating

enhanced toll lanes for I-405 to relieve congestion and also provide funding for needed improvements. Example, we are here today debating the issues due to 1) not having a reasonable well thought out plan to collect or provide legislatively sufficient funding for the eventual replacement of significant infrastructure, let alone maintain what we have, 2) relying on Gas Tax revenue that does not address other legislative mandates (Federal & State) regarding improved fuel efficiency and associated reduced emissions, 3) reduced VMT combined will not and is not a sustainable and economically adjustable revenue, and 4) recognizing other land use changes that have occur and are being developed that reduce trips, VMT, and provide for expanded transportation choices that do not rely on the automobile.

Move forward with tolling now, to reduce the overall cost, i.e., while fuel costs are down and not \$5.00 per gallon, and anticipating that the economic downturn in the Puget Sound region, has lagged relative to other areas, and will likely rebound in a shorter amount of time - especially considering other global events, i.e., Olympics and high technology growth within the region - which also acknowledges the ability to implement LRT - positive regional support.

Establish realistic rates and investment strategies for revenues collected to maximize the overall return and reduce total net cost for the project. Example, acquire right-of-way as early as possible, implement in stages to reduce impact and lower construction costs, while advancing mitigation of impacts, which also sends a clear policy message to communities west of Lake Washington.

And if failure of the existing structure is realistic - realistically then a project and the funding for the project need to happen, if not how realistic is structural failure...

Ensure investment equity, such that Eastside communities receive appropriate mitigation, benefits from early implementation, and equity to the revenue generated as the orientation and destination of total trips change.

Make eligible other investments for transportation system improvement that can use tolling revenue relative to the corridor, including improvements east to SR 202, I-405/520 interchange, implementation of BRT & station upgrades, and recognize that at some point 50 years from now there may be a need for future upgrade/replacements and expansion to serve LRT, etc. Meaning consider the long term needs/consequences/benefits...

Find a more attractive/method for implementing on vehicles and recording transponder's that 1) does not have a toll bridge impacting the visual corridor heading west - Seattle Skyline and Olympics; and something on the front of a vehicle that can easily be damaged or taken.

Let's move on toward fixing roadways and highways of regional significance, as debating it and waiting for Seattle communities to come to some form of conclusion would suggest - if they believe that the facility is of significant impact then access to/from is of little interest, therefore, eliminate access and provide HOV/Transit ramp access only in the vicinity of Montlake, which also narrows the overall footprint, while maintaining the six lane corridor typical section.

---

**From:** Ron Bailey  
**Source:** info@build520.org  
**Date:** 11/06/2008  
**Zip Code:** 98033  
**Comment:** Wait a bit on your decision. Obama is going to throw a whole bunch of money at state construction projects to put people to work so get the balance of what you need from the Feds. We didn't have tolls on I-90. Don't want them on 520!

If you must toll, put them on when the project is completed and take them off when its paid for! None of this nonsense of running it into eternity.

---

**From:** Renay Bennett  
**Source:** info@build520.org  
**Date:** 11/06/2008  
**Zip Code:** 98004  
**Comment:** Please, no tolls on any road or bridge. This state has plenty of money to fund its Constitutional duties of transportation. The problem is that the most of the electeds currently scheming in Olympia and in many municipalities fund special programs and welfare to the detriment of our state.

Please do not use tolls. This only gives the schemers more money taken from us poor taxpayers who fund their spending sprees - and which they never spend appropriately.

**From:** Eric Wuellner  
**Source:** info@build520.org  
**Date:** 11/07/2008  
**Zip Code:** 98006  
**Comment:** I feel any tolling implemented should be applied to the project only. No tolls should be placed on I-90. It is only fair to have those who use it finance it. I feel I contribute my share already in the gas and state taxes I pay. I also feel it should be a flat toll implemented as early as necessary to fill the funding gap.

**From:** Lise  
**Source:** info@build520.org  
**Date:** 11/08/2008  
**Zip Code:** 98052  
**Comment:** As an Eastsider I am greatly concerned about the talk of tolls on the 520 bridge. I am not a commuter and traffic is rarely a problem for me personally. As a mother I enjoy taking my children to the Seattle zoo. If I am charged the toll, plus the processing fee I may not go to the Seattle zoo. Or the Science center, Aquarium, Pike Place, Mariner games, Alki Beach and dozens of other places we love to go for a family day out. Dates with my husband will definitely be confined to the Eastside. Bellevue and Issaquah are offing more in the way of theater and dinner. They will get my business. I am even more concerned about my access to Childrens Hospital. My son recently broke his leg. He has had so far, a 5 day stay, 2 surgeries, and countless clinic appointments. We have met many Eastsiders at the hospital that are there long term - - children with cancer, children with genetic issues etc... The medical bills are overwhelming. I cannot imagine having to add on top of all of that a "toll" to go and take my son to see a doctor! The one question I do have is why is the hill approaching 92nd in Bellevue very slow and then it opens up as you get on the bridge deck? Or why is it usually slow at the Arboretum and then picks up speed? Perhaps it is not the bridge's fault! I have seen "government" ruin and/or waste many many things in my 30 years on the Eastside (those sparkly statues that replaced the fountains at the Seattle end of 520), please be very careful as you decide what to do.

**From:** Don Gerend  
**Source:** info@build520.org  
**Date:** 11/08/2008  
**Zip Code:** 98075  
**Comment:** A tolling scenario starting with tolling SR-520 in 2010, followed by adding tolling to I-90 in 2011 or 2012, would allow real measurement of the diversion effects, rather than simply theoretical calculations based on modeling or speculation, and would give a firmer basis for any mitigation considerations. Once the new bridge is built with six lanes, it will handle more traffic than the present one, even with moderate tolls, and thus eliminate any negative diversion effects. So, starting with lower tolls and increasing them when the bridge is completed, seems logical in efforts to minimize diversion effects.

**From:** Frans Koning  
**Source:** info@build520.org  
**Date:** 11/08/2008  
**Zip Code:** 98006  
**Comment:** Start NOW or ASAP with tolling I-90 and 520.  
  

1. Have some construction money up front and less toll later.
2. Make travellers get used to it.
3. Tolling probably will reduce traffic NOW and provide
4. Encouragement to use existing public transportation

**From:** Lorrie Peterson  
**Source:** info@build520.org  
**Date:** 11/08/2008  
**Zip Code:** 98053  
**Comment:** State of Washington,

Thank you for evaluating ways to fund the SR520 Bridge Replacement/Expansion. Please incorporate my comments into your analysis.

My vote is to expand the bridge and nearby infrastructure of SR 405 to accept the additional volume of traffic as soon as possible and appreciate that the State is looking at ways to fund this project.

My opinion is:

1) That you listen to both the Bellevue City Council and somewhat the Kirkland City Council to determine what their recommendation would be, based on their analysis and impacts to those adjacent Cities.

2) I do not believe you should solely toll the SR520 Bridge. Living in Redmond, Union Hill, as I travel to visit our daughter at Seattle University, I would take alternative routes to avoid paying a toll, such as connecting to I-90 either via City of Sammamish, or SR405. When we move back to our home in Bellevue, I would take surface streets in Bellevue to avoid a toll on SR520 and impact neighborhoods. I do not believe tolling one bridge is sufficient to reduce congestion, but would support whatever alternative the Bellevue City Council forwards to you.

3) I think the costs I've heard for daily trip is very high and would be a hardship for most middle income folks. I drive to Bellevue for my employment so wont be impacted daily, but feel it will be difficult for many middle or low income folks to afford. Recommend you start tolling asap, so you can keep the cost low and build up the funds.

4) State needs to work with King County to expand Rapid Transit, Bus Routes, and park and ride lots. Great to hear that the Initiative passed so project will be constructed to Microsoft in Redmond, but park and ride lots are not sufficient for the current need, let along the additional numbers that will come once the bridge is expanded so new park and rides or larger facilities are needed now.

I'm an excellent candidate to park and bus to the Bellevue Transit Center; but every time I've tried to park my car at Bear Creek it is completely overflowing by 7 AM. I cant get their earlier due to family/school needs, as I'm sure is the case for many working families.

I've then attempted to park at the park and ride by Microsoft, but it too fills up early. I will not spend an additional hour driving on and off the freeway looking for park and rides, although I would love to do my part and get my car off the road sooner.

5) Medina, Clyde Hill & Bellevue should receive PARK LIDS over the freeway such as on Mercer Island. This is an excellent way to provide parks and open space for the public. We use the Mercer Island LIDS regularly for soccer and biking and this amenity should be expanded to other Cities.

Thank you for listening and for all the transportation projects the State is completing throughout the State of Washington.

Sincerely,

Lorrie Peterson

**From:** Joann Swartzinger  
**Source:** info@build520.org  
**Date:** 11/09/2008  
**Zip Code:** 98034  
**Comment:** PLEASE REMOVE ME FROM YOUR MAILING LIST. THANK YOU.

**From:** Dorothy "D.J." Guth  
**Source:** info@build520.org

**Date:** 11/09/2008  
**Zip Code:** 98033  
**Comment:** Tolling should begin as soon as possible on both 520 and 90 and should go towards fund better transit options(light rail too if possible!) accross the lake. I think the election has shown that people realize how important keeping the current carpool/HOV lanes and we all know that bicycle lanes are a MUST on the next bridge (I would probably bike 50% of the time if there were a decent bike route to downtown). I currently buy the annual Flexpass and take transit 80% of the time to get to my job in downtown Seattle from Kirkland. Thank you.

**From:** Ellen Hanly  
**Source:** info@build520.org  
**Date:** 11/10/2008  
**Zip Code:** 98033  
**Comment:** I am in favor of tolling on both bridges simultaneously . Also I think buses or people on them should be tolled. In other words, everyone pays equally as we all benefit equally.

**From:** Judy Redding  
**Source:** info@build520.org  
**Date:** 11/10/2008  
**Zip Code:** unknown  
**Comment:** Sounds like if estimates are reasonable, tolling both bridges beginning 2010 -- with tolling variable -- would be most cost effective, as well as contributing to less congestion. Interesting [illegible]. Glad I listened in.

**From:** Phil Tracey  
**Source:** info@build520.org  
**Date:** 11/10/2008  
**Zip Code:** 98053  
**Comment:** I would at the very least expect that the folks on Mercer Island would be taxed double....they have had a personalized freeway for them the last 15 years and should finally pay for it themselves.  
  
READ MY LIPS;  
NO NEW TAXES. WE ARE ALREADY TAXED TO DEATH. USE THE MONEY FROM THE BASEBALL STADIUM THAT WAS VOTED DOWN.  
  
OR USE THE MONEY FROM THE EXISTING GAS TAX....OR USE THE MONEY FROM OTHER EXISTING TAXES....LIKE THE LIGHT RAIL "STUDIES" THAT HAVE ALREADY COST US MILLIONS.  
  
BETTER YET....GET A GOVERNOR THAT KNOWS HOW TO HANDLE MONEY AND USES IT THE WAY THE PEOPLE WANT IT USED!  
  
NO NEW TAXES. WHAT HAVE YOU PEOPLE BEEN SMOKING?????

**From:** Hans Gundersen  
**Source:** TIC Meeting #7 (Redmond)  
**Date:** 11/10/2008  
**Zip Code:** 98052  
**Comment:** I live in Redmond, and am engaged in transportation issues. Have lived and used rapid transit systems all over the world, some good, some not good. I am pleased that we aspire to build a world class city with a world class transportation system. Staff has done a wonderful job looking at the various options, some of which may not be viable. One concern: it appears congestion management will be built into the tolling

plan. I think this is a terrible mistake and bad policy for the following reasons:

1. You are putting a tax on people who are trying to work. No one asks an employee when they want to come to work. It appears to me the way we need to approach congestion relief is to approach the employers – ex. What can we do about flexible work hours?

2. As we design a system that's going to have variable rates depending upon when, who, what...the complexity of designing and operating this system increases exponentially. I have spent 30 years working in governance, financing...you are going to spend so much money on overhead to manage the system. The only thing that makes sense is Scenario 9: a flat rate, 24/7, 1 point on each bridge. If Mercer Island doesn't like that they can establish their own ferry system. If you go with this type of system, it is easy to manage and you can then focus on the primary objective, which is financing the bridge. You can do it in perpetuity as well to pay for maintenance. I am somewhat dismayed that we are constructing a 520 bridge for the past. We are constructing a new bottleneck rather than building an 8-lane bridge with light rail. Thanks so much.

**From:** Scott Penner

**Source:** Tolling web survey

**Date:** 11/11/2008

**Zip Code:** 98004

**Comment:**

1. The committee's materials/questions seems to continuously suggest that traffic on I-90 will be only moderately affected if only 520 is tolled. I-90 will be a parking lot. People don't have an extra \$1500 a year just to cross 520.
2. The proposed tolls are excessive. Most people drive because they simply can't take the bus. I routinely pick up children on my way home from work and bus is not an option.
3. It is ridiculous that peak tolls start at 5 am. Give people a chance to get to work by 6 am without a toll or with a small toll.
4. Before you toll, you better get the bus service up to snuff or it will be Tim Eyman time again (and I am not a TE fan).

**From:** Phil Tracey

**Source:** Tolling web survey

**Date:** 11/11/2008

**Zip Code:** 98053

**Comment:** THIS A YET ANOTHER SCREWED UP...STICK IT TO THE PEOPLE...TYPE OF "FIX" THAT THIS STATE GOVERNMENT HAS WASTED YET MORE MILLIONS OF TAX DOLLARS. WHEN ARE YOU GOING TO COME UP WITH SOME "OUT OF THE BOX" THINKING AND SOLUTIONS INSTEAD OF THE SAME THING....TAX THE PEOPLE MORE. AGAIN...HAVE YOU LAID OUT THE PLAN AND ASKED FOR INPUT FROM ANYONE OTHER THAN THE SAME OLD FOLKS THAT HAVE PAID AND TAXED US TO DEATH? THIS IS A PATHETIC EXCUSE FOR "SOLVING THE BRIDGE PROBLEM". AND...EVEN IF IT IS FIXED, WILL YOU STILL TAX MOTORCYCLES AND BICYCLES? HOW ABOUT BABY STROLLERS AND SKATEBOARDS?.....PROBABLY....GOD HELP US ALL.....

**From:** Mark Kimball

**Source:** Tolling web survey

**Date:** 11/11/2008

**Zip Code:** 98040

**Comment:** IF tolling is imposed on either or both bridges it should ONLY be imposed on the bridge segments -- not on the portion of 520 up to the bridge and not on the East Channel Bridge of I-90. Mercer Island residents should not be required to pay a toll to cross the East Channel bridge.

**From:** Jamie McKay

**Source:** Tolling web survey  
**Date:** 11/11/2008  
**Zip Code:** 98074  
**Comment:** I think having electronic tolling is a superb way to collect money for improving 520 and building another bridge across. I think it is also the way to deal with ongoing upkeep of I-90, however I do not think that you should toll other roads right now until people get used to I-90 and 520 tolls and see that it is a necessary and Ok thing to do. I think you should figure out how to subvert Tim Eyman from starting an initiative to reduce the toll rates before he has a chance to think to do it! By that I mean that maybe you should have some third party build the road and collect the tolls, with a portion being diverted to the city funds for transit and bridge improvements, etc. You know darn well he's just going to play to people's irritation at changes, and make it a vote on reducing tolls once you get it going, so figure out now how to deal with that!

**From:** Arnie Brandon  
**Source:** Tolling web survey  
**Date:** 11/11/2008  
**Zip Code:** 98006  
**Comment:** Tolls, if any should be ONLY on 520 to pay for 520. Nothing more, nothing less.

**From:** James Duvall  
**Source:** Tolling web survey  
**Date:** 11/11/2008  
**Zip Code:** 98011  
**Comment:** 1. THESE QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN POORLY PRESENTED. FOR EACH QUESTION YOU SHOULD HAVE A CHOICE THAT CAN REFLECT PARTIAL AND/OR COMPLETE DISAGREEMENT WITH THE TOLLING CONCEPT!  
2. TOLLS ARE NOT THE ANSWER IN ANY WAY, SHAPE OR FORM. WE NEED A SYSTEM SIMILAR TO THE JAPANESE HIGH SPEED ELECTRIC TRAIN CONCEPT. THE CONSTRUCTION ALONE WOULD PROVIDE MORE JOBS, HELP THE ECONOMY, REDUCE AIR/GROUND POLLUTION, GASOLINE USAGE, BENEFIT ROAD/HIGHWAY/ PARKING CONGESTION EVERYWHERE AND MUCH MORE!  
FINANCING/PLANNING/CONSTRUCTION/USAGE FEE STRUCTURE COULD BE READILY ACHIEVED THROUGH A MUTUAL/COMMITTEE EFFORT. THE COMMITTEE TO BE COMPOSED OF APPROXIMATELY 15 OR LESS MEMBERS WHICH WOULD INCLUDED BANKERS, UNION REPS, CITY STATE/FEDERAL LEGISLATORS OR REPS, BUSINESS LEADERS, CITIZENS AND ATTORNEYS ( AT LEAST ONE OF EACH CATEGORY, NECESSARY EXCEPTIONS WOULD BE TWO MAX). FINANCING COULD UNDERWRITTEN BY LOCAL/COUNTY/STATE/FEDERAL FUNCTION IN SUPPORT OF THE BANKING INDUSTRY WHO WOULD PROVIDE THE FUNDS, OVERSEE FINANCIAL AUDITS AND ASSURE ETHICAL PRACTICES HERE.  
PARTICIPATING PRIVATE FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS WOULD BE GUARANTEED A REASONABLE PROFIT (POSSIBLY IN THE RANGE OF 4-8%); HANDLE THE OUTLAY OF FUNDS FROM BEGINNING TO SYSTEM IMPLEMENTATION. POSSIBLY THERE COULD EVEN BE SOME INITIAL PUBLIC FUNDING GRANTS FROM EXISTING GOVERNMENTAL FUNCTIONS WHICH WOULD ASSIST IN MINIMIZING COSTS. THE PAYMENT FOR THIS TOTAL SYSTEM WOULD EXTRACTED FROM THE FEE STRUCTURE FOR USAGE OVER AN ESTABLISHED PERIOD OF YEARS BASED ON CURRENT AND "AFTER IN USE STUDIES" WHICH COULD DETERMINE CONTINUED NEED AND AMOUNT LOOKING A PERMANENT MAINTENANCE/UPGRADE/TECHNOLOGY REQUIREMENTS! I HAVE MORE HERE AND IF YOU'RE INTERESTED CONTACT ME AT MY E MAIL ADDRESS!

**From:** John Metzger  
**Source:** Tolling web survey  
**Date:** 11/11/2008  
**Zip Code:** 98053  
**Comment:** Don't underestimate the cheapness of the public. Tolling only 520 will create massive traffic jams on I-405, I-90 and I-5 as the majority of people will choose the cheaper route. The only way to make a tolling project work is if both east/west routes into seattle are tolled. Introducing a toll system to pay for 520 also sets an interesting precedent in Wa. From this point onward, the public will expect all major road projects to be tolled so that the users of the project bear the brunt of the payment. Formerly the gas tax was used to fund major projects and the cost was spread throughout the state. As a taxpayer that will pay quite

heavily to cross 520 8x a week I would insist that other major road projects are funded by tolls, especially those that I get no benefit from.

**From:** Bill Eames  
**Source:** Tolling web survey  
**Date:** 11/11/2008  
**Zip Code:** 98033  
**Comment:** Yes, its simple. Gas Tax only! If there are legal impediments, then they should be removed. Me and others support the gas tax idea. All roads need improvement. Look at Europe gas tax rates, they have good transit. Tolling tempts government to raise it up and up. What about people who use 520 to go to Children's or University hospital (specialized care not avail on Eastside) when there is no choice? They will pay toll too. We need light rail not just I-90, but all around the sound (I-405 and I-5 around the lake and across the lake) Additionaly bus service is needed; a spiderweb of good bus service in the metropolitan area with minimal transfers).  
  
Thanks,  
Bill Eames

**From:** Anonymous  
**Source:** info@build520.org  
**Date:** 11/11/2008  
**Zip Code:** 98052  
**Comment:** User tolls should allow for reduced rates for students, educators, school faculty and other groups that can show hardship.  
  
If you end up collecting a toll, do not slow down traffic by physicaly collecting a toll on the highway.

**From:** Grace Ngai  
**Source:** Tolling web survey  
**Date:** 11/12/2008  
**Zip Code:** 98006  
**Comment:** If you toll both I-90 and 520, you are unfairly penalizing the eastside residents with heavy financial hardship. For those of us who has to go to Seattle seven days a week, for work, church and family, the financial burden is too great. You should not toll I-90 but give people the option of a toll-free road even if it means heavier traffic. Eastside residents are not all affluent!! We should not be the targeted group to shoulder all the cost of building and maintaing an Interstate Freeway!!! This is the responsibility of the State. Thank you.

**From:** Renay Bennett  
**Source:** Tolling web survey  
**Date:** 11/12/2008  
**Zip Code:** 98004  
**Comment:** These questions are very rigged to imply support for tolls by asking those of us who do not want tolls to pick which toll we want. Also, the last question implies that tolls are already a done deal, "when 520 is tolled." We do not need to toll at all. We have plenty of money to pay for infrastructure. What we have is a legislature that spends too much and creates programs to buy votes.

**From:** Anonymous

**Source:** Fall 2008 OH VC - Bellevue  
**Date:** 11/12/2008  
**Zip Code:** unknown  
**Comment:** The pie chart with where the money is coming from – what is “other”?

**From:** Anton Fedorinko  
**Source:** Tolling web survey  
**Date:** 11/12/2008  
**Zip Code:** 98005  
**Comment:** I strongly support tolling both the 520 and the I-90 bridge

**From:** Anonymous  
**Source:** Fall 2008 OH VC - Bellevue  
**Date:** 11/12/2008  
**Zip Code:** unknown  
**Comment:** Are you planning to toll I-405 also, to make your social engineering work?

**From:** Anonymous  
**Source:** Fall 2008 OH VC - Bellevue  
**Date:** 11/12/2008  
**Zip Code:** unknown  
**Comment:** What is variable tolling? Is it the same Monday at 7:00 am and Tuesday 7:00 am?

**From:** Anonymous  
**Source:** Fall 2008 OH VC - Bellevue  
**Date:** 11/12/2008  
**Zip Code:** unknown  
**Comment:** Will they make special arrangements for Mariner's games and other things like that?

**From:** Anonymous  
**Source:** Fall 2008 OH VC - Bellevue  
**Date:** 11/12/2008  
**Zip Code:** unknown  
**Comment:** How many people did you survey to see who would shift to other routes or transit?

**From:** Anonymous  
**Source:** Fall 2008 OH VC - Bellevue  
**Date:** 11/12/2008  
**Zip Code:** unknown  
**Comment:** We're on Mercer Island – I appreciate hearing about this meeting. I'm grateful for the change I see in the

options. One option would be not tolling I-90 at all, which is my preference. But I'm grateful to see an alternative that leaves tolls off the East Channel Bridge.

**From:** Anonymous  
**Source:** Fall 2008 OH VC - Bellevue  
**Date:** 11/12/2008  
**Zip Code:** unknown  
**Comment:** Did the model include tolling transit? Have you talked with Metro about how their rates would change? On the transit diversion, how does the model distinguish between additional transit because of the project and additional transit because of the toll? So it's more about additional service then the toll rates?

**From:** Anonymous  
**Organization:** Coca-Cola  
**Source:** Fall 2008 OH VC - Bellevue  
**Date:** 11/12/2008  
**Zip Code:** unknown  
**Comment:** What about commercial trucks? I work for Coca-Cola, I'm worried about how this works. Am I okay for 2009? And can I assume once these numbers are firm, can I assume tripling these numbers to get my costs? The rates we saw are passenger car – what would a heavy truck or bus pay? What about scooters or motorcycles?

**From:** Anonymous  
**Source:** Fall 2008 OH VC - Bellevue  
**Date:** 11/12/2008  
**Zip Code:** unknown  
**Comment:** Change of destination – did that consider people moving to new homes?

**From:** Anonymous  
**Source:** Fall 2008 OH VC - Bellevue  
**Date:** 11/12/2008  
**Zip Code:** unknown  
**Comment:** Are you only going to set the tolls once and not change them? Or do you have to meet funding targets or improve traffic?

**From:** Anonymous  
**Source:** Fall 2008 OH VC - Bellevue  
**Date:** 11/12/2008  
**Zip Code:** unknown  
**Comment:** When I look at #1 and #3, it will raise \$835 million starting in 2016, and with both bridges in 2016 you raise \$2.2 billion. It seems like if you put a flat rate on both bridges in 2010 you could raise a lot of money.

**From:** Anonymous  
**Source:** Fall 2008 OH VC - Bellevue

**Date:** 11/12/2008  
**Zip Code:** unknown  
**Comment:** Would the toll rate end? What's the advantage of the complex models instead of just asking people?

**From:** Anonymous  
**Source:** Fall 2008 OH VC - Bellevue  
**Date:** 11/12/2008  
**Zip Code:** unknown  
**Comment:** What about low-income drivers on 520? How many people fit into that and what's the standard for low-income?

**From:** Anonymous  
**Source:** info@build520.org  
**Date:** 11/12/2008  
**Zip Code:** unknown  
**Comment:** What about occasional users? How do you collect the toll?

**From:** Anonymous  
**Source:** Fall 2008 OH VC - Bellevue  
**Date:** 11/12/2008  
**Zip Code:** unknown  
**Comment:** The tolling revenue is about 50% of the cost of the 520 construction. In the event that there's a major cost overrun, does that percentage stay the same, or does it all fall on the toll payer?

**From:** Anonymous  
**Source:** Fall 2008 OH VC - Bellevue  
**Date:** 11/12/2008  
**Zip Code:** unknown  
**Comment:** With two bridges, does I-90 get additional capital improvements?

**From:** Anonymous  
**Source:** Fall 2008 OH VC - Bellevue  
**Date:** 11/12/2008  
**Zip Code:** unknown  
**Comment:** Historically I approve of tolling, since I work part time on census bureau I know we have diversity of incomes and I worry about older people and how to handle that. Some downtown destinations, it would take many transit transfers.

**From:** Anonymous  
**Source:** Fall 2008 OH VC - Bellevue  
**Date:** 11/12/2008

**Zip Code:** unknown

**Comment:** I want to say that I'm not for tolling. I think the bridge was never cared for properly to keep it up to date, and now we shouldn't have to be replacing a bridge. We shouldn't have to be facing tolls. I work two and three jobs and have to go continually back and forth. It astounds me that we're in a situation where we have to toll ourselves for a new bridge. I'm really against it. And what will it do to traffic when they start work on the bridge? Isn't that going to make it worse? If it has to be replaced I would do just the four lanes. And I'm wondering also about the light rail and could they really do it?

**From:** Karen Kerr

**Source:** Tolling web survey

**Date:** 11/13/2008

**Zip Code:** 98007

**Comment:** Please strongly consider tolling both 520 and I-90. I favor collecting tolls faster and keeping the toll as low as possible.

**From:** Richard Cole

**Source:** Tolling web survey

**Date:** 11/13/2008

**Zip Code:** 98052

**Comment:** Please implement tolls on both bridges as soon a possible.

**From:** Ellen Hanly

**Source:** info@build520.org

**Date:** 11/13/2008

**Zip Code:** 98033

**Comment:** Thanks for your reply. I'll try to keep up with the action by email.

**From:** Carol Hallenbeck

**Source:** Tolling web survey

**Date:** 11/13/2008

**Zip Code:** 98007

**Comment:** if you are going to toll 520 at the rate purposed it will cost 200.00 a month how do you think people making less than 30000.00 a year can afford a road tax that high a flat 1.00 a trip tax would be workable but not the rates that i have read about the dot in this state has wasted so much money why trust you this time you the state will bleed us common folk to death till we just leave this state and find a new home elsewhere

**From:** Kruller

**Source:** info@build520.org

**Date:** 11/13/2008

**Zip Code:** 98052

**Comment:** What a nightmare!! This is going to be the worst, most unfair tax increase ever. The burden of the tolls is going to fall on families like mine, even if we cannot afford it.

I do not understand how we can find 17 Billion dollars for a train system that will have less impact in moving people from place to place. But we cannot find the money to pay for the 520 bridge that will spread the cost of the new bridge over a wider tax base so, no one group carries an unfair burden. In fact,

the state governor never ever tried to find funding, she when right to tolls without offering any other options.

The 520 bridge is now carrying 130 thousand cars, trucks and buses now each day. And is projecting 180 thousand vehicles in the future. With car pools and buses that's got to be 250 thousand people crossing the bridge each day now and about 350 thousand people crossing in the future when the new bridge is finished.

The Mass Transit Guide, put out by The Sound Transit 2 Plan people, stated that in 2030 its daily ridership will be 286,000 for link light rail. Most of which ride the bus now. That is 4.25 times more costly than the whole 520 bridge cost. Shouldn't the link rail need to move 4.25 times more people than the 520 bridge to justify spending that much more tax payer money on link rail and not the 520 bridge. Like I said, state governor never ever tried to find funding, she when right to tolls without offering any other options.

While it is common to hear the argument "let the bridge users pay for the bridge that's fair". The reason I state that tolls are UNFAIR is that instead of spreading the cost of the bridge over a wide tax base that would have cost me under \$100 dollars a year along with everybody else. I will pay more like \$2000 dollars a year and though my taxes at the same time I get to pay for every other highway project in the state so they don't have to pay for a tolls.

Please put this information in your Report.

By the way I like how your report showed traffic speeds will increase when you add tolls.

Of course anytime you turn 23% of the traffic away from using the bridge because they can not afford the tolls, is going to speed up traffic.

But, is turning away people from using a public bridge (a bridge their taxes are paying for the half the tolls don't ), the right way to increase traffic speeds on the bridge.

---

**From:** Keith Holsapple

**Source:** Tolling web survey

**Date:** 11/14/2008

**Zip Code:** 98039

**Comment:** This poll is designed with a strong bias that assumes a person is against tolling. It is not a good poll to obtain unbiased information.

Thank You

---

**From:** Robert Carlson

**Source:** Tolling web survey

**Date:** 11/14/2008

**Zip Code:** 98075

**Comment:** I still feel that tolling to build the 520 bridge is a bad idea. It will be the new 'bridge to nowhere', as the more expensive it is to work on the west side of Lake Washington, the more businesses will move east of the lake.

---

**From:** Sandy Stromme

**Source:** info@build520.org

**Date:** 11/15/2008

**Zip Code:** 98052

**Comment:** Single rate toll, toll both bridges, start in 2010. This will have one effect I think- more people will take buses (a small number will drive around the lake) - so add more buses (between Overlake and U-district for example, a missing and needed route). This approach has the most predictable outcome and avoids

creating new issues. Thanks for your consideration.

**From:** Darrell Scattergood  
**Source:** Fall 2008 OH Comment Form  
**Date:** 11/17/2008  
**Zip Code:** 98006  
**Comment:** I personally paid for 520 bridge during the entire tolling period. I've paid huge Federal and State gasoline and license fees for roads I never use. It is immoral if not illegal to unfairly tax me for the roads I use. Toll every road or toll none.  
  
Trucks greater than 5 tons underpay for their use of highways. Make their toll at least 10x that of vehicles under 5 tons.

**From:** Jeff Lundstrom  
**Source:** info@build520.org  
**Date:** 11/18/2008  
**Zip Code:** 98074  
**Comment:** I would like to see tolls start of both bridges in 2010. I will pay the toll.  
  
I feel that it is appropriate to toll I-90 across the floating portion of the bridge, but not the east channel bridge. I am surprised that Mercer Island residents think they should be exempt from paying any tolls ever - they are some of the wealthiest residents in the entire state. They don't get the fact that if I-90 isn't tolled so many people will divert to I-90 from SR 520 that I-90 will become very congested - they are paying a toll to keep I-90 a viable corridor. People can cross the floating bridge for \$0.75 during off-peak periods, that's cheaper than a half-hour of parking; that is more than reasonable.  
  
Consider spending some of the I-90 toll funds on the I-90 corridor, maintenance maybe. Take the current maintenance funds for I-90 and divert them to pay for the SR 520 bridge and use the I-90 toll collection to pay for maintenance on I-90.

**From:** Dr. Michael Jones  
**Source:** Tolling web survey  
**Date:** 11/21/2008  
**Zip Code:** 98006  
**Comment:** Why not include a range of possible toll costs for respondents? Each way? One way only? etc.

**From:** Doug Hitchcock  
**Source:** Tolling web survey  
**Date:** 11/24/2008  
**Zip Code:** 98006  
**Comment:** Users should pay for their use of the bridge. I pay user fees for everything I do. I pay a fishing license, a crab license, a boat fee, a boat trailer fee, a truck fee, a camper in the back of the truck fee, and when I go to launch the boat i have to pay a boat launch fee. I pay all the fees for hunting ect, I pay when i go to Mariners. I pay when I go to Seahawks, beer, pop, cokes hotdogs etc. Putting tolls on both bridges will increase usage of the busses, diamond lanes, reduce congestion, pollutionm, parking lots improve the environment, drive gas usage and prices. It is a win for everyone so don't let the not in my back yard complainers prevent the tolls on both bridges and start NOW. And I am a Republican. But let those who have to use the bridges pay for them not everyone all over the state or thru higher taxes. I may use the I-90 ten times a year and never use 520 ajnd I don want to pay for every one eles who needs to use it.  
Doug Hitchcock 425-747-4888 15307 SE 43rd PI Bellevue, 98006

**From:** Joan Klyn  
**Source:** Tolling web survey  
**Date:** 11/24/2008  
**Zip Code:** 98004  
**Comment:** Did I miss a query about tolling I-90? If tolling on SR520 begins in 2010 I strongly support beginning tolls on I-90 at the same time. Joan Klyn

**From:** David Maltz  
**Source:** info@build520.org  
**Date:** 11/24/2008  
**Zip Code:** 98007  
**Comment:** Having no toll booths at all is a non-starter. I will vote and organize against the idea. You want to effectively ticket all visitors to the area? Render them unable to use at least one, if not both bridges across the lake? Think of the tourist implications alone! Think about reputation! Think about how hard it already is to attract the best software talent to Seattle...  
  
If building toll booths is impossible without completely breaking traffic flow, then "surcharge" for vehicles without transponders had better be \$1 or less, or else this whole idea will be rightfully quashed.

**From:** Karen Kardell  
**Source:** info@build520.org  
**Date:** 11/25/2008  
**Zip Code:** 98007  
**Comment:** I think tolling is ridiculous! If the state would stop squandering money and actually stick to a budget and spend money on road improvement instead of a useless and far too late transit system it would make more sense. This toll WILL SEVERELY HURT DAILY COMMUTERS THAT ARE IN LOWER PAYING JOBS. Here we go again - tax the poor instead of levying larger property taxes, etc. against those who can afford more money. Washington is the worst state I have ever encountered as far as it's Department of Transportation. We will continue to lose more and more businesses as stupid ideas like this reach fruition. You can be sure I will NEVER BE SHOPPING IN SEATTLE AGAIN as I live on the Eastside and will not pay this toll. This will hurt businesses on both sides of the lake. Once again, the State of Washington is determined to drive businesses out of the state and hurt low to middle income drivers.

**From:** Stephen Gripe  
**Source:** Tolling web survey  
**Date:** 11/25/2008  
**Zip Code:** 98075  
**Comment:** NO TOLLS!

**From:** Keith Cross  
**Source:** info@build520.org  
**Date:** 11/26/2008  
**Zip Code:** 98006  
**Comment:** My opinion is that it is unfair to surcharge out of state users by not having toll booths. They frequently don't know their way around and would get fined for taking a wrong turn. Seattle would get another black mark for being unfriendly to out of area drivers. How rude does Seattle want to appear to our families, friends and casual visitors from out of the area?

**From:** Darrell Scattergood  
**Source:** Tolling web survey  
**Date:** 11/30/2008  
**Zip Code:** 98006  
**Comment:** Put a toll on both state-supported sports stadiums in Seattle. Put a toll on I-5 through Olympia. Make trucks pay more than 4x autos or forbid truck use (also forbid bus use).

**From:** Dave Martin  
**Source:** Tolling web survey  
**Date:** 11/30/2008  
**Zip Code:** 98039  
**Comment:** Bikes should be tolled (they pay to hang a bike on Metro buses and pay a fare). Montlake should pay tolls for use of the Portage Bay Viaduct (probably a smaller toll). Quiet pavement made a requirement.

**From:** Richard Partington  
**Source:** Tolling web survey  
**Date:** 11/30/2008  
**Zip Code:** 98008  
**Comment:** 1) If high peak hour tolls are used, I expect that employers will wind up reimbursing their employees.  
2) Why consider a flat rate toll of \$1.70 if it will not raise the required money? I would favor a flat rate, but please tell us what the number will be. I would prefer a flat rate on only the 520 bridge starting in 2016.

**From:** Rick Logwood  
**Source:** Tolling web survey  
**Date:** 11/30/2008  
**Zip Code:** 98033  
**Comment:** If both facilities (I-90 and 520) have tolling starting in 2010, why same rate as SR 520 alone? What is the total projected savings based on the options? What improvements are proposed to I-90, should I-90 be included? What firewalls are put in place that ensure ST or Metro are accountable for their costs and routes - most equity. What provisions will be put in place should economics change and revenue be higher or less than projected or WSDOT cost to complete be higher or less than anticipated?